

REMARKS

Claims 3-4, 8-9, 11-12, 15-16, and 19-20 are currently pending in the application. Claims 3-4, 8-9, 11-12, 15-16, and 19-20 remain rejected.

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,209,089 (Selitrennikoff).

On page 10 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleged that Applicants do not “specify or claim where the execution script is executed or performed and is therefore arguing unclaimed features.”

In response, Applicants respectfully submit that the language of claim 20, for example, reads, “said data being installed on said client by an agent residing on said client according to a reading of an execution script residing on the server.” Therefore, the agent residing on the client installs data on the client based on a reading of the script, which resides on the server. In other words, although the execution scrip is stored on the server, the client computer, which is connected to the server, reads the execution script while the script is on the server.

As is defined in the specification, the execution script includes definition information for setting execution instructions, which are required to install a file and read by the agent 12 in the client 200. See specification of the present invention, page 7, lines 30-35. See *also* Figs. 1 and 2. Thus, in response to the Examiner’s comment regarding where the execution script is executed, Applicants respectfully submit that the script is not executed. Rather, the script, residing on the server, is read by the client. The script is referred to as an “execution script” due to the fact that it includes definition information for setting execution instructions.

In contrast to the present invention and contrary to the Examiner’s assertion on page 10 of the Office Action, Selitrennikoff’s loader is not read by the client while it is on the server. Rather, as Selitrennikoff clearly states, the client computer requests the loader from the server. See Selitrennikoff, column 12, lines 51-57. In response, the server sends the loader to the client, where the loader is executed. Therefore, as the loader is transmitted to the client, the loader cannot be read from the server, as it resides on the client.

In response to the Examiner’s comment regarding the word “reside” not appearing in Applicants’ specification, Applicants respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the relevant art would readily appreciate the meaning of the term in light of the specification and drawings of the present invention. For example, as is clearly illustrated in Fig. 1, the agent 12 resides on the client 200.

Therefore, claims 19 and 20 are patentable over Selitrennikoff.

On page 3 of the Office Action, claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,598,159 (McAlister). The Examiner alleged that McAlister discloses, "instructing an agent residing on the client to install data on the client according to a reading of a script residing on the server." Applicants respectfully submit that in contrast to the present invention, the network boot agent downloads a script from the server to perform execution. See McAlister, column 5, lines 54-55. Therefore, claim 19 is patentable over McAlister.

On page 4 of the Office Action, claims 3, 8, and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Selitrennikoff in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0156965 (Gusler). As Gusler does not cure the deficiency of Selitrennikoff, claims 3, 8, and 11 are patentable over the combination of references.

As Rodriguez does not cure the deficiency of Selitrennikoff, claims 4 and 9 are patentable over the combination of references. As claim 12 depends from claim 4, claim 12, via claim 4, is patentable over the combination of references, as Rodriguez and Gusler do not cure the deficiency of Selitrennikoff. Claim 15, via claim 3, is patentable over the references, as none of the cited references cure the deficiency of Selitrennikoff. Claim 16, via claim 4, is patentable over the cited combination of references, as Cheffetz and Rodriguez do not cure the deficiency of Selitrennikoff.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

By: 

Reginald D. Lucas
Registration No. 46,883

Date: May 24, 2007

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501